

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 28 and 31-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 28, 31-33, and 35 have been amended and claims 29, 30, and 37-46 have been canceled. These amendments and cancellations have been made in order to expedite the prosecution. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C §102(e)

Claims 28-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by “Style Sheets”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have been unable to locate a dated copy of the “Style Sheets” reference applied and cited by the Examiner on the PTO form 892. Applicants respectfully request verification of the December 24, 1999 date supplied on the PTO form 892 through the provision of either a dated copy or a link to the provided date.

Applicants also respectfully request clarification with respect to the copy of the reference applied. On page 4, line 8, the Office Action refers to page 13 of the “Style Sheets” reference. Applicants’ copy of the reference includes only twelve pages. If the reference applied exceeds twelve pages, applicants respectfully request a copy of the applied reference.

Although applicants are uncertain of the applicable date for “Style Sheets”, applicants respectfully submit that this reference fails to show many features of the invention of claim 28 as originally presented and as currently amended.

The “Style Sheets” reference discloses a technique for allowing web page designers to improve the appearance of web pages. This document has no applicability whatsoever to rendering graphical control components in non-markup language applications as required by claim 28. The portions of the document cited in the Office Action to illustrate application of the technique to rendering graphical control components in non-markup language applications appear to refer to the language of the style sheets themselves and not the applications in which the graphical components are

rendered. The applicability of the "Style Sheets" reference is limited to rendering of components in HTML documents, which are typically web pages.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 28 as amended, "Style Sheets" fails to disclose a method for consistently rendering a graphical control component for both a web page and a non-markup language application. "Style Sheets" also fails to disclose providing a themed control dynamic link library within a computer operating system and providing a fusion component linking each non-markup language application with the themed control dynamic link library within the computer operating system, the fusion component enabling theming of the non-markup language application graphical control component within each non-markup language application without altering the non-markup language application. "Style Sheets" additionally fails to show responding to each rendering request from both the web page and the non-markup language application through a theme manager, the theme manager connected with the themed control dynamic link library to communicate with the non-markup language application and with an alternate dynamic link library to communicate with the web page. "Style Sheets" also fails to show determining whether a defined theme META tag is present and affirmatively set in the web page when responding to a web page rendering request and routing the rendering request to the theme manager. "Style Sheets" fails to show a theme manager having tools responsible for rendering graphical control components in accordance with at least one defined theme for both the web page and non-markup language applications.

Claims 31-36 depend from claim 28 and define further distinctive features of the invention. Accordingly, claims 31-36 define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 28. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, claims 28 and 31-36 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is

Application No. 09/728,725.
Amdt. dated November 24, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004

hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment,
to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.76396.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 24, 2004



Kerry H. Owens
Reg. No. 37,412

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 474-6550